



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,767	11/27/2001	Ming-Sum Fang	12283	7588

20686 7590 04/21/2005

DORSEY & WHITNEY, LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
370 SEVENTEENTH STREET  
SUITE 4700  
DENVER, CO 80202-5647

EXAMINER

CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/993,767

**Applicant(s)**

FANG ET AL.

**Examiner**

Salvatore Cangialosi

**Art Unit**

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/27/01, 04/18/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 3621

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Desai et al(6877093) in view of either Kawagishi (6707892) or Ohki et al(6644553).

Regarding claim 1, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a method for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit card terminal and application program download. It is noted that the transaction terminal is a card terminal and the configuration download through a network is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Each of Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines

Art Unit: 3621

5-30, and claim 5) or Ohki et al (See Fig. 17 and claim 5) show the downloading of application programs by card terminals. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Desai et al because configuration downloads are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding the protocol limitations of claim 2, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding web limitations of claim 3, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing web servers(element 616) that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding data limitations of claim 4, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading a data stream employing TCP/IP protocol that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the command limitations of claim 5, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data

Art Unit: 3621

employing TCP/IP protocol and batch processing (See Col. 8, lines 45-55) that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding dial-up limitations of claim 6, Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) show the downloading of application programs by card terminals via telephone or internet that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding downloading limitations of claim 7, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 8, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a method for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit card terminal and application program download. It is noted that the transaction terminal is a card terminal and the configuration download through a network is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Each of Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) or Ohki et al (See Fig. 17 and claim 5) show the downloading of application programs by card terminals. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to

Art Unit: 3621

provide a similar arrangement for Desai et al because configuration downloads are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding the protocol limitations of claim 9, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding web limitations of claim 10, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing web servers (element 616) that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding data limitations of claim 11, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading a data stream employing TCP/IP protocol that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding dial-up limitations of claim 12, Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) show the downloading of application programs by card terminals via telephone or internet that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding data limitations of claim 13, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose

Art Unit: 3621

remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading a data stream employing TCP/IP protocol including display(Fig. 4) that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding network limitations of claim 14, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading a data stream employing TCP/IP protocol that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding downloading limitations of claim 15, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading a data stream employing TCP/IP protocol that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 16, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a method for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol and providing transaction data of a terminal substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit card terminal and activity of the terminal. It is noted that the transaction terminal is a card terminal and the activity data through a network is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Each of Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) or Ohki et al (See Fig. 17 and claim 5) show the

Art Unit: 3621

transaction activity reports by card terminals. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Desai et al because transaction activity are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding time limitations of claim 16, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a method for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol and providing transaction data of a terminal that is the conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations because financial transaction activity is preferably instantaneous in electronic commerce. Regarding dial-up limitations of claim 18, Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) show the downloading of application programs by card terminals via telephone or internet that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the protocol limitations of claim 19, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding web limitations of claim 20, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing web servers



Art Unit: 3621

(element 616) that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding display limitations of claim 21, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a method for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol and providing transaction data of a terminal via a display(element 51) that is the conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding transaction limitations of claim 22, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a method for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol and providing transaction data of a terminal activity with timestamps that is the conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 23, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a means for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit card terminal and application program download. It is noted that the transaction terminal is a card terminal and the configuration download through a network is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Each of Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) or Ohki et al (See Fig. 17

Art Unit: 3621

and claim 5). show the downloading of application programs by card terminals. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Desai et al because configuration downloads are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding the protocol limitations of claim 24, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding web limitations of claim 25, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing web servers(element 616) that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding data limitations of claim 26, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading a data stream employing TCP/IP protocol that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the command limitations of claim 27, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol and batch processing

Art Unit: 3621

(See Col. 8, lines 45-55) that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding dial-up limitations of claim 28, Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) show the downloading of application programs by card terminals via telephone or internet that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding downloading limitations of claim 29, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 30, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a means for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit card terminal and application program download. It is noted that the transaction terminal is a card terminal and the configuration download through a network is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Each of Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) or Ohki et al (See Fig. 17 and claim 5) show the downloading of application programs by card terminals. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Desai et al because

Art Unit: 3621

configuration downloads are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding the protocol limitations of claim 31, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding web limitations of claim 32, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing web servers (element 616) that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding data limitations of claim 33, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading a data stream employing TCP/IP protocol that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding dial-up limitations of claim 34, Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) show the downloading of application programs by card terminals via telephone or internet that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding data limitations of claim 35, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading a data

Art Unit: 3621

stream employing TCP/IP protocol including display(Fig. 4) that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding network limitations of claim 36, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading a data stream employing TCP/IP protocol that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding downloading limitations of claim 37, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading a data stream employing TCP/IP protocol that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding claim 38, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a means for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol and providing transaction data of a terminal substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit card terminal and activity of the terminal. It is noted that the transaction terminal is a card terminal and the activity data through a network is functionally equivalent to the claim limitations. Each of Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) or Ohki et al (See Fig. 17 and claim 5) show the transaction activity reports by card terminals. It would have

Art Unit: 3621

been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Desai et al because transaction activity are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding time limitations of claim 39, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a method for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol and providing transaction data of a terminal that is the conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations because financial transaction activity is preferably instantaneous in electronic commerce. Regarding dial-up limitations of claim 40, Kawagishi (Figs. 7, 10, Col. 2, lines 5-30, and claim 5) show the downloading of application programs by card terminals via telephone or internet that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding the protocol limitations of claim 41, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations. Regarding web limitations of claim 42, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing web servers (element 616) that is conventional functional equivalent of the

Art Unit: 3621

claim limitations. Regarding display limitations of claim 43, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a method for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol and providing transaction data of a terminal via a display(element 51) that is the conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations. Regarding transaction limitations of claim 44, Desai et al (See Figs. 3-6, 8-9, Col. 3, lines 45-65, Col. 4, lines 1-50, Col. 6. lines 30-40 and claims 1,8, 10) disclose a method for remotely configuring a transaction terminal by downloading data employing TCP/IP protocol and providing transaction data of a terminal activity with timestamps that is the conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

It is noted that claims 1-15, 23-37 represent one invention, and claims 16-22, 38-44 represent a second independent invention not requires the download of programs. Should the two groups persist in subsequent action a restriction will be issued.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number **(571) 272-6927**. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can

Serial Number: 09/993,767

15

Art Unit: 3621

be reached at **(571)272-6712**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**or faxed to (703)872-9306**

Hand delivered responses should be brought to

United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5771**.



Serial Number: 09/993,767

16

Art Unit: 3621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**SALVATORE CANGIALOSI**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 222**